

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the requirement for restriction to either the invention of claims 1-25 or the invention of claims 26-51, claims 26-51 have been cancelled to elect the invention of claims 1-25.

In response to the requirement for election of either the species of figure 1 or the species of figure 2, applicants elect the species of figure 2, with traverse. The undersigned respectfully traverses to the extent of any misunderstanding by the undersigned as to what are the mutually exclusive characteristics of figure 1 in comparison to figure 2. According to MPEP 806.05(d), *“Species are always the specifically different embodiments.”* (Emphasis in the original.) However, applicants’ figure 2 “is a block diagram of a portion of the system of FIG. 1 showing in more detail the construction of the decoders.” (Applicants’ specification, page 12, lines 6-7.) According to MPEP 806.04(f): “Claims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive. The general test as to when claims are restricted, respectively, to different species is the fact that one claim recites limitations which under the disclosure are found in a first species but not in a second, while a second claim recites limitations disclosed only for the second species and not the first. This is frequently expressed by saying that claims to be restricted to different species must recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species.” Therefore, the undersigned understands the requirement for election of species to be asking the applicants to elect either an embodiment having multiple decoder pairs as shown in FIG. 1 or an embodiment that need not have multiple decoder pairs as shown in FIG. 2. In view of the election of the invention of claims 1-25, the undersigned is intending to elect an embodiment that need not have

multiple decoder pairs so as to present apparatus claims that should be examined and issued together with the method claims 1-25 in one patent in accordance with MPEP 803 unless this would present a serious burden upon the examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that each and every one of claims 1-25 is readable upon the species of figure 2.

New claims 52-75 have been added, which are similar to original claims 26 to 43 and 45-50 but which have been drafted consonant with the election of the invention of claims 1-25 and the election of the mutually exclusive characteristics of figure 2 in comparison to figure 1. It is respectfully submitted that each and every one of claims 52-75 is readable on the species of figure 2.

In short, the listing of claims readable on the elected species of figure 2 is claims 1-25, 52-75.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Auchterlonie
Reg. No. 30,607

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5320
Houston, TX 77002
713-751-0655